Single Bench

(4)

CF-1061

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 4374/2006

Service.

PETITIONER

Pawan Kumar Soni @ P.K. Soni, S/o Shri Geeta Prasad Soni, aged about 32 years, occupation service, R/o Barpali, PO. Barpali, Tahsil Kartala, District Korba, Chhattisgarh.

P.R. No. 4441/06
Presented by Shri O.P. Yadav
dated 13/4/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1) State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary and Ministry of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes Development Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, (C.G.)

5/11/06

2) Commissioner, Tribal Development Department, Ravi Shankar University Campus, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

RECEIVED-COPY
14/8/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

3) The Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development Department Korba, Chhattisgarh.

4) Block Education Officer, Kartala, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

1. Particul

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ...WP 4374/06... **सन्** 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	18.8.2006 Mr. Om Prakash Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner. Mrs. Anju Ahuja, Dy. Govt. Adv. for the respondents on advance copy. Heard. By the instant petition the petitioner has challenged his transfer order dated 30.6.2006 (Annexure P-1) whereby he has been transferred under the Rationalization Scheme, 2006. Clause-7 of the rationalization scheme provides that if any person is aggrieved by the transfer made under the rationalization scheme, then he is entitled to file an appeal before the authority mentioned in clause-7 of the scheme. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that appeal has already been preferred by the petitioner on 17.7.2006, but the same is not being disposed of by respondent No.2-Commissioner. In view of the above, the petitioner has equally, efficacious, alternative remedy to redress his grievance and infact, the petitioner has already availed of that remedy, therefore, the petition is not maintainable and same is dismissed. However, respondent No.2-Commissioner is directed to decide the appeal of the petitioner at the earliest. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.3392/06 also stands dismissed. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	

P.T.O.